

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELETTRA MEEKS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

EXPERIAN INFORMATION
SOLUTIONS, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 21-cv-03266-VC

**ORDER RE MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL**

By 5 p.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, May 31, the plaintiffs shall file a brief (with supporting documentation) explaining what fraction of recovery the members of the proposed (b)(3) class should expect from the settlement fund. From the current filings it is impossible to tell whether class members will receive nearly a full recovery, or whether pro rata reductions will result in a very low recovery. It is therefore impossible for the Court or proposed class members to decide whether the settlement is fair and reasonable.

The Court has identified the following other issues, which may be addressed in that brief or discussed at the hearing:

1. The settlement agreement and proposed order say this Court will retain jurisdiction over whether future disputes are released by the agreement. This Court does not retain such jurisdiction (as opposed to jurisdiction over injunction relief).
2. Both notices and the proposed order should say that the final approval hearing will be by Zoom.
3. The (b)(2) notice confusingly says both that there is “only one” settlement (question 5) and that the fund will go to a “separate . . . settlement for certain class

members” (question 8).

4. The proposed order incorrectly says that objections must be served by ECF. Objectors do not need to file using ECF.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 30, 2023



VINCE CHHABRIA
United States District Judge